



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/004,783	12/04/2001	Timothy E. Moses	10500.01.7101	8446	
23418	23418 7590 04/05/2005			EXAMINER	
VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ 222 N. LASALLE STREET			NGUYEN, MINH DIEU T		
CHICAGO, II			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2137		
			DATE MAILED: 04/05/200:	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			A		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/004,783	MOSES ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Minh Dieu Nguyen	2137		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.15 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from . cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)[🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 D</u>	ecember 2004.			
2a)□					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims	•			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicat	Claim(s) 8,11-15,24 and 27-30 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 8,11-15,24 and 27-30 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or ion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examine	wn from consideration.			
•	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		Examiner.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati nity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage		
2) Noti	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	r (PTO-413) ate Patent Application (PTO-152)		

Application/Control Number: 10/004,783 Page 2

Art Unit: 2137

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment and response dated December 27, 2004 have been entered with the amendments of claims 8 and 15.

Claims 8, 11-15, 24, 27-30 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, filed December 27, 2004, with respect to the rejection(s)of claim(s) 8, 11-15, 24, and 27-30 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Perlman et al. (5,687,235).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 4. Claims **8, 12-15, 24, 28-30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Perlman et al. (5,687,235).

Application/Control Number: 10/004,783 Page 3

Art Unit: 2137

a) As to claims 8, 13-15, 24 and 29-30, Perlman et al. discloses a method for updating a user's list of public key certificates issued by a certification authority on a distributed communications system (Fig. 2). In the invention, a public key certification authority issues a list of the certificates that have been revoked (called a "blacklist"), either periodically or on demand, in order to allow the user to update its list (col. 6, lines 12-29). This establishes the current state of the art with regards to public key certificates and that a user updating its list of public key certificates is well known in the art (col. 7, lines 19-23). Perlman provides a facility for monitoring a specific public key certificate identified by the update subscription information, (i.e. monitoring begins after a client requests it, which corresponds to providing subscriber subject information, col. 7, lines 46-49) and indicates the user when it changes (i.e. applying to the step of generating a reply, an indication of a change while on-line, col. 7, lines 49-61).

Perlman also discloses the user updating its information based on the indication of change (col. 8, line 64 to col. 9, line 2). The method of Perlman is a procedure to be implemented by computer hardware, and therefore also comprises an apparatus.

b) As to claims 12 and 28, Perlman teaches necessary step to take in monitoring any certificates. In order to monitor the certificates, its value must first be known, then compared with a previously known value. To determine the value, it must be accessed on the database, which constitutes pulling it from the database (i.e. certification revocation list storage provided by certificate authority, Fig. 2).

Application/Control Number: 10/004,783 Page 4

Art Unit: 2137

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

As to claims 11 and 27, Perlman teaches the invention substantially as claimed, see the rejections of claims 8 and 24 above. Perlman does not teach an encoded message with the change to the public key certificate. The examiner takes official notice that it is well known to encrypt information related to security when transmitting it over a non-secure network (i.e. encoding message with the change to the public key certificate).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement encoding message identifying the change to the public key certificate of Perlman so as to provide security against impostering on networks.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Dieu Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3873. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00-2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2137

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Minh Dieu Nguyen Examiner Art Unit 2137

mdn 3/31/05

ANDREW CALDWELL SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

andrew Caldin